

REMARKS

The Final Office Action rejected all pending claims (claims 1-5, 7-21, 32-35, and 44-46) on the basis of either McGee (U.S. 5,752,518) or the combination of McGee and Morantte (U.S. 4,587,972). The Action specifically noted that McGee disclosed a coil-like enclosure and referred to col. 11, line 60 - col. 12, line 9 in McGee as evidence of a coil-like enclosure. Applicant believes that McGee does not disclose a coil-like enclosure as claimed in the claims for the reasons explained below.

In McGee, the alleged "coil-like enclosure" is not an enclosure which concentrically surrounds the optical fiber. Rather, each of McGee's coils surround a corresponding element 22 of the support structure 20. The coil in McGee does not concentrically surround any optical fiber in McGee. Furthermore, the optical fiber in McGee is not bonded to at least one point along the inner surface of the coil in McGee and, in fact, any attempt to so bond the optical fiber would destroy the purpose of the support structure 20 as it is designed to create a space around the optical fiber. The McGee support structure is designed so that the imaging element can be steered without moving the support structure (see, for example, col. 1, lines 53-56 of McGee). Hence, McGee does not anticipate the present claims and a combination of McGee and Morantte is not an adequate prima facie basis for an obviousness rejection. Thus, the present claims should be allowed.


If any fees are due in connection with this response, please charge our Deposit Account

No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 3/8, 2006


James C. Scheller, Jr.
Reg. No. 31,195

Customer No. 008791
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300